

Development of the Initial CTC-CAEP Agreement April 2014

Overview

This agenda item presents a draft of the initial CAEP Agreement for the Committee's review.

Staff Recommendation

That the COA discusses the issues identified related to the CAEP Agreement and provide direction to the staff for the continued development of the protocol.

Background

The Commission and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) have worked in partnership since the 1980s. Beginning in 2010, the Commission entered into a partnership agreement with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). These protocols have allowed institutions in California to host joint accreditation visits. Joint visits allow the institution the opportunity to provide information to both the state and national accrediting team concurrently. Although there are different processes and possible outcomes for each, the joint visit structure has proven successful.

Now that NCATE and TEAC have unified into the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and, as the current NCATE/CTC protocol expires at the end of the year, there is a need to revisit and develop a new protocol agreement. At its February 2014 meeting, the COA discussed the development of the initial CAEP Protocol. Administrator Hickey led the discussion which identified some specific topics that the new protocol should address. (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-02/2014-02-item-13.pdf>)

The NCATE Protocol allowed both NCATE and the Commission to identify exactly how the joint accreditation process would take place. The template for the CAEP Agreement is less specific than the most recent NCATE Protocol. The organizational structure of the NCATE Protocol and the CAEP Agreement is shown in the table below. There are places in the agreement where staff believes that additional specificity should be included.

NCATE	CAEP
I. Standards A. Unit Standards B. State Program Standards	I. Standards A. CAEP Standards—Need an alignment matrix to the Commission's Common Standards ¹ B. State Standards
II. Team A. Team Composition: Joint State/NCATE B. Training Expectations C. Team Size D. Chair Responsibilities: Joint Visit E. Consultants/Other Participants	II. Process of National Accreditation A. Process ² B. Accreditation is for 7 years

NCATE	CAEP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> F. NEA/AFT Representation G. Decision-Making H. Writing the Report I. Evaluations J. Expenses 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> III. Preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Unit's Intent-to-Seek request B. Preconditions C. Program Reports D. Institutional Report E. Dates of On-Site Visit F. Previsit G. 3rd Party Testimony 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> III. Standards and Processes for Program Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Choose among any of the Program Review options that the Commission has approved B. CTC Responsible for Initial Program Approval—On-going review, see III. D C. CAEP accepts decisions of national accrediting organizations D. Types of program review—which options will California allow? ¹³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CAEP with National Recognition 2. CAEP Program Review with Feedback 3. Commission Review of programs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IV. On-Site Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Orientation to State Process/Protocol B. Conducting On-Site Review C. Evidence/Exhibit Room D. BOE Report E. Exit Conference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IV. Accreditation Review Team Composition ¹⁴ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Need to address how the team will work together -Need to address the Off-Site Meeting as well as the Onsite Visit -Need to address observers on the site visit team
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> V. After the On-site Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. BOE Report B. Rejoinder C. Accreditation and Approval D. Final Action Report E. Appeal Procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> V. Other Terms and Conditions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Training-CAEP will work with CTC B. CTC will receive copies of all documents C. CTC will notify CAEP regarding change in status of an institution or program D. Responses to final reports—follow CAEP policy E. Institution fee due to CAEP F. CTC Annual membership fee due to CAEP G. Partnership Agreement valid for 7 years-May be modified during the period of the agreement if both parties agree H. CTC will work with associations that represent P-12 educators, EPPs, and education administrators regarding continuing education units ¹⁵ I. Terms of agreement reached by mutual consent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VI. On-Going Responsibilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Protocol Distribution B. Accreditation Cycle C. Code of Conduct D. Annual Reviews E. Regional Accreditation F. Change in State Status G. Precondition 7 H. Annual Report 	

Staff has identified 5 topics addressed by the draft protocol where a decision needs to be made regarding how this component of joint CTC-CAEP accreditation activities will take place. Staff at CAEP provided an initial outline of the CTC-CAEP Agreement and the initial draft is

provided in Appendix A. These five topics are identified with a superscript number in the table above and in Appendix A. The identified topics follow:

- 1) Alignment of Standards—Focuses on how the CAEP Standards align with the Commission’s Common Standards and if an institution meets the CAEP Standards what additional work, if any, would need to be done for the COA to know that the institution meets the Commission’s standards.
- 2) Accreditation Process—The CAEP process offers three options for an institution: Continuous Improvement (NCATE), Inquiry Brief (TEAC), and Transformation Initiative (NCATE). The CAEP policy is that each institution has the choice of any of these three accreditation processes.
- 3) Program Review—CAEP has identified three options for Program Review. The CAEP policy is that each program is able to choose any of the types of program review that by agreement may be used in that state. The COA needs to determine which of the three program review options are acceptable for use in California.
- 4) Team Composition—This topic involves a number of items related to who serve on the team, when members are identified, who can be an observer and how the CAEP portion of the team will work with the California portion of the team.
- 5) Continuing Education Units/Professional Development for participating in the accreditation process. Currently California has no statewide requirement related to continuing education or professional development. Staff will need to work directly with institutions, bargaining organizations, and others to address this component of the agreement.

The COA’s discussion of these five topics, and any additional aspects of the CTC-CAEP Protocol, will inform the next draft of the CTC-CAEP Protocol. Each of the five identified topics is discussed in more depth below.

Standards Alignment

The first topic that needs additional work is the alignment of the 5 CAEP Standards to the Commission’s Common Standards. The COA has the responsibility to determine if standards are comparable to the Commission’s adopted standards (Education Code §44373(c)(3)). The COA discussed how well the CAEP standards are aligned to the Commission’s Common Standards at the October 2013 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2013-10/2013-10-item-13.pdf>). At this time, there are a number of topics in the Commission’s Common Standards that are not addressed by the CAEP Standards but it may be premature to complete the CAEP-CTC Standards alignment given the upcoming work the Commission is undertaking to revise its standards, including the Common Standards.

CAEP Accreditation Processes

The second topic focuses on the three different accreditation processes that CAEP has developed. These three options are based on approaches to accreditation activities that NCATE and TEAC have previously used. Both the Continuous Improvement and Transformation Initiative were NCATE accreditation activities while the Inquiry Brief was the TEAC model. In California there has been limited experience with the Transformation Initiative and the Inquiry Brief

models but many institutions have completed the Continuous Improvement process. With respect to the Transformation Initiative model, staff believes that clear criteria need to be developed before an institution should be deemed eligible to begin a Transformation Initiative. Staff believes that the eligibility criteria should include that the institution was meeting the Commission's standards at its last accreditation site visit, that all required reports (Biennial Reports and Program Assessment) and activities have been submitted and all evidence points to the fact that the institution is still meeting the Commission's standards before the institution is eligible to enter into the Transformation Initiative process.

Program Review Options

The third topic focuses on which of CAEP's three *program* review options are appropriate in California for on-going program review and approval. Currently, all Commission-approved programs must participate in the Commission's accreditation activities—Biennial Reports and Program Assessment—for ongoing program approval. Staff recommends that all California educator preparation programs should continue to participate in the Commission's accreditation system and neither the *CAEP Specialized Professional Association review with the option of National Recognition* nor the *CAEP Program Review with Feedback* should be allowed in California. This would mean that the only program review option that would be allowed in California would be the Commission's review of educator preparation programs for on-going approval. It is important to remember that the Accreditation Study Work Group (2004-2006) strongly recommended that all California educator preparation programs should participate in the Commission's accreditation system.

Team Composition

The fourth topic is a multi-layered topic. Team composition is a critical aspect of joint accreditation activities. The first issue is whether CTC/CAEP accreditation site visits should be joint CTC-CAEP visits or concurrent review visits. The NCATE visits began as concurrent visits, but evolved into true joint visits. The institutions have less work to do when the visit is a true joint visit and the team has the expertise of both California educators and those CAEP members from out of state. Staff would encourage the COA to endorse joint visits in the CTC-CAEP Protocol.

The Continuous Improvement and Transformation Initiative process both include an off-site meeting that takes place approximately 4 months prior to the site visit. As the NCATE process developed into this two-step (Off-Site Review and the On-Site Visit) process, the California members of the joint team have not always been consulted when the Off-Site Review is scheduled. Staff recommends that California insert language into the protocol that all team members working on the CAEP portion of the visit—CAEP and California—must be consulted when scheduling the Off-Site Review. Additionally, the California Co-Chair for the visit, the team lead identified by the Administrator of Accreditation, often does not have time for the extensive preparation that occurs before the Off-Site Review nor the time spent at the On-Site Visit when responsible for Standards writing. Staff recommends that California's protocol state that the California Co-Chair will not write to a CAEP Standard for the Off-Site Review or the On-Site Visit unless it is negotiated and approved by the Administrator of Accreditation when the team is selected.

Another issue that is related to the composition of the team is in regard to individuals serving as observers on the site visit team. In a few instances, an observer has been identified for a site visit. The observer has been a faculty member at a neighboring institution of higher education. Staff worked with the NCATE staff to develop an approval process for observers, establishing that the observer may not be from an institution that is geographically close to the institution hosting the site visit and the observer must be made aware of the code of conduct for team members and agree to abide by it. Staff recommends that similar language be negotiated with CAEP.

Continuing Education Units and/or Professional Development Requirements

The fifth topic identified is the section of the protocol that says that the Commission will work with associations that represent P-12 educators, preparation entities, and education administrators to establish credit toward continuing education units or professional development requirements at the local level in return for participation in the accreditation process. The CAEP policy states that participation in accreditation activities should satisfy local district level requirements. Staff needs to contact the associations that represent P-12 educators, the entities that prepare educators, and education administrators to discuss this portion of the CAEP Protocol once COA has had input regarding this requirement.

Next Steps

Based upon the COA's discussion and action taken at the April meeting, staff will develop a revised draft of the CTC-CAEP Protocol. The draft protocol will be discussed by the Commission and return to the COA at a future meeting for consideration and possible adoption.

Appendix A—DRAFT Partnership Agreement

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation Partnership Agreement

In order to promote excellence in educator preparation by coordinating California approval and national accreditation reviews of educator preparation providers (EPPs), and to eliminate duplication of effort and reporting, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) enter into this partnership agreement. The agreement describes the partnership and delineates the processes and policies for CAEP accreditation in California.

I. Standards for National Accreditation of Educator Preparation Providers

- A. CAEP educator preparation provider standards must be met on the basis of sufficient and accurate evidence to merit national accreditation by CAEP.¹¹
- B. California's academic content standards and the Commission's educator preparation standards also may be applied in the CAEP accreditation process.

II. Process of National Accreditation for Educator Preparation Providers

- A. The process required for national accreditation by CAEP is outlined in CAEP policies. EPPs seeking CAEP accreditation must satisfy eligibility requirements, submit a self-study in a CAEP-approved format for formative feedback through off-site review, facilitate the posting of a call for public comment and distribution of third-party surveys to stakeholders, host a site visit, and complete an approved program review process for all programs of study leading to professional practice in a school setting.¹²
- B. Terms of accreditation shall be for seven (7) years. EPP accreditation status is subject to CAEP policies, including annual payment of fees and submission of an annual report as required.

III. Standards and Processes for Program Review

- A. The educator preparation provider may choose from among any of the three program review options listed in III.D below that have been approved by CTC in this partnership agreement. EPPs will submit program reports following the instructions for the selected program review process. **[This language is from the CAEP Template and works with the program review options in III.D.]**
- B. The CTC has sole responsibility for initial program approval. The CTC will utilize information generated from the three program review options to make decisions regarding CTC continuing program approval. Using information provided as part of

the accreditation and program review process, the CTC makes the final decision on approval of all programs.

- C. As evidence of quality, CAEP accepts the decisions of national accrediting organizations for specialized professional program areas that are recognized by the U.S. Department of Education or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Proper documentation of current accreditation must be presented by the EPP.

1. California has developed alignment matrices with selected specialized professional associations. Institutions holding national accreditation with one of the SPAs may elect to use the national accreditation as part of the Program Assessment process.
2. National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)
3. Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)
4. American Speech-Language Association (ASHA)
5. Council on Social Work Education Educational Policy Standards (CSWE-EPAS)

- D. For purposes of CTC program approval, the CTC recognizes the following [final agreement shows only the accepted] program review options: ¹³

1. **CAEP Program Review with National Recognition:**

CAEP Program Review with National Recognition applies specialized professional associations' (SPA) standards in the SPA review process and can result in national recognition. The CTC will review the program review report and will make a decision on continued California approval.

See: Websites of CAEP and of particular SPAs for more information.

2. **CAEP Program Review with Feedback:**

CAEP Program Review with Feedback provides information to educator preparation providers, states, and accreditation teams. The CTC will review the feedback report and will make a decision on continued California approval. Program clusters will be reviewed by trained CAEP reviewers.

See: www.caepnet.org or more information.

3. **California Review by CTC:**

The CTC conducts program reviews for purposes of California approval and to inform CAEP accreditation. The CTC provides forms and instructions on how to meet all California Standards for licensure/certificate program approval. Upon completion of the CTC forms, trained reviewers are selected and assigned within appropriate content areas. Reviewers make recommendations for further action and/or approval.

EPPs will choose from among these review options for each license or certificate

program (and may choose different options for different programs).

IV. Accreditation Review Team Composition ¹⁴

The Accreditation Review Team is appointed by CAEP according to the guidelines and policies for each selected accreditation pathway. If the Continuous Improvement Pathway (CI) or Transformation Initiative Pathway (TI) is selected, the state may choose to use either joint CAEP/CTC or concurrent review teams [final agreement shows only the chosen team type]

The following conditions apply to all teams:

- All members of Review Teams must have successfully completed CAEP review team member training or comparable training provided by California.
- A P-12 practitioner shall be a member of each CAEP team.
- The California Teachers' Association(s) may appoint an observer for the onsite review at the associations' expense. The observer must not have a conflict of interest with the institution or be from an institution within close geographic proximity if the observer is from an EPP.
- The EPP will assume all expenses – including travel, lodging and meals – for CAEP team members as well as the periodic evaluation fee. Onsite team activities will be conducted according to CAEP policy.
- The CAEP team report will be shared with the CTC.
- To assure educator preparation providers and the public that CAEP reviews are impartial and objective, to avoid conflicts of interest, and to promote equity and high ethical standards in the accreditation system, Accreditation Review Team members will adhere to CAEP's Code of Conduct.

V. Other Terms and Conditions

- A.** CAEP will collaborate with the CTC to plan, design and implement a range of training opportunities for reviewers. As part of this agreement, CTC contact(s) may participate in all web trainings. The registration fee, for one CTC contact will be waived for one annual CAEP Conference; however the California contact must assume other expenses. CAEP will assume all expenses for one CTC contact to attend the annual CAEP Clinic, with additional California staff welcome at their own expense, including a registration fee. Additional training events may be arranged, including events in the state, on a cost-recovery basis with arrangements negotiated according to CAEP's policies regarding fees and expenses for training.
- B.** The CTC will receive copies of all pertinent accreditation and specialized program area approval documents and reports through access to the Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS); agency personnel will be supplied with login information, passwords, and technical support. In addition, the state consultant needs a word version of the report at the conclusion of the site visit.
- C.** The CTC will provide to CAEP its policy leading to a "Change in Status." The CTC will notify CAEP within 30 days of action taken when a CAEP accredited educator

preparation provider has had a “Change in Status” as a result of a decision on specialized professional program status by the CTC for educator preparation.

- D.** Responses to the final reports by the EPP and/or the CTC will follow procedures and timelines established in CAEP policy.
- E.** California EPPs that are seeking CAEP accreditation or hold CAEP accreditation status will pay annual CAEP dues.
- F.** The CTC will be responsible for annual CAEP membership dues. Final accreditation decisions are posted on CAEP’s website. CAEP sends the Executive Director of the CTC a letter with the official accreditation decision. Additionally, CAEP provides written notice of all accreditation decisions to the U.S. Department of Education, the CTC, all accrediting agencies recognized by the U.S. Department of Education, and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, and the public (via the CAEP website).
- G.** The partnership agreement shall be for an initial period of seven years (December 1, 2014 through November 30, 2021) and may be modified by the two parties during that time, if deemed to be necessary and both parties are in agreement.
- H.** The CTC will work with associations that represent P-12 educators (i.e., CTA, CFT, NBPTS), education preparation providers, and education administrators to establish credit toward continuing education units or professional development requirements at the local district level in return for the state's P-12 educators’ professional contributions to the work of CAEP as visiting team members or program reviewers.¹⁵
- I.** The terms of this agreement have been reached by mutual consent and have been read and understood by the persons whose signatures appear below. The parties agree to comply with the terms and conditions of the plan as set forth herein.

James G. Cibulka, President
Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)

DATE

Mary Vixie Sandy, Executive Director
Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC)

DATE